

THE DESIDERIAN SCRIPTORIUM  
AT MONTE CASSINO  
THE *CHRONICLE* AND SOME  
SURVIVING MANUSCRIPTS

FRANCIS NEWTON

The following paper is substantially the same as that delivered at the Symposium on "Monte Cassino" held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1975.

The research on which this study is based was made possible by the generous support of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Research Council of Duke University. I am also especially indebted to the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in Paris, and particularly to the members of its Section Latine and Section Codicologique.

THE manuscript library assembled at Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages was a creation above all of the eleventh century. The abbey's own *Chronicle* acknowledges that even as late as the beginning of the rule of Abbot Theobald in the year 1022 the Cassinese library was small. Referring to books, Leo, the author of this part of the *Chronicle*, says, . . . *hic maxima paupertas usque ad id temporis erat*.<sup>1</sup> He then proceeds to list the manuscripts which Theobald had copied to make good this deficiency. Leo's successor, who continued the *Chronicle* of the abbey, hands down to us another list of books which a still more powerful abbot, Desiderius (1058–87), caused to be copied at Monte Cassino.<sup>2</sup> Even today, when time has greatly reduced the size of the medieval collection, we may test in a simple statistical way the picture that the chroniclers drew of the poverty of the book collection through the tenth century and of its enrichment at the hands of the magnificent abbots of the eleventh. A rough count shows that of the six hundred Monte Cassino MSS listed in Inguañez' catalogue<sup>3</sup>—and these six hundred include most of the medieval ones—one hundred ninety-six date from the eleventh century alone, as compared with forty-nine from all the earlier centuries together. In the acquisition of books, as in other aspects of the material and artistic wealth of the abbey, the eleventh century was its golden age.

The most imposing notices recording an abbot's activity in the enriching of the library of manuscripts are those left by Abbot Desiderius. It is the purpose of this paper to examine those Desiderian notices, especially the book list given in the *Chronicle*, in conjunction with a selection of the surviving MSS. Such an examination is a necessary preliminary to a full-scale study of the library, and demonstrates both the value and the limitations of the several kinds of evidence available to us in reconstructing the Cassinese library as it was in the second half of the eleventh century.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Leo of Ostia, *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, II.53, ed. W. Wattenbach, in MGH, SS, VII (Hannover, 1846; rep. Leipzig, 1925), 662.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 746–47. The new date assigned by Professor Hoffmann to the MS Monte Cassino 450, which is our source for this part of the *Chronicle*, and the many details uncovered by the same scholar's paleographical analysis of that MS thoroughly confirm the conclusion that it was the monk Guido who continued Leo's *Chronicle* to IV.95. See H. Hoffmann, "Studien zur Chronik von Montecassino," *DA*, 29 (1973), 59–152, esp. 138–52.

<sup>3</sup> M. Inguañez, *Codicum Casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus*, 3 vols. (Monte Cassino, 1915–41).

<sup>4</sup> There is no modern study of the history of the Monte Cassino scriptorium. The most valuable of the older studies are A. Caravita, *I codici e le arti a Monte Cassino*, vols. I–III (Monte Cassino, 1869–71), and L. Tosti's account, which forms the introduction to *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, I (Monte Cassino, 1874), pp. i–liii (rep. in L. Tosti, *Opere complete, Scritti vari*, II [Rome, 1880], 47–157). For script and ornament in particular, see also C. Piscicelli-Taeggi, *Paleografia artistica di Montecassino. La scrittura longobardo-cassinense* (Monte Cassino, 1877); *ibid.*, *La scrittura latina* (Monte Cassino, 1884); and *idem*, *Le miniature nei codici cassinesi* (Monte Cassino, 1888ff.). These are the principal sources for the best of the early 20th-century accounts, the historical sketch by E. A. Loew (Lowe) which serves as the opening chapter of his monumental *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914), 1–21 (this chapter reprinted in E. A. Lowe, *Palaeographical Papers 1907–1965*, I [Oxford, 1972], 70–91). Today we have a wide-ranging survey of the cultural history of the abbey to the beginning of the 12th century, including for every stage a discussion of the development of the manuscript collection, in H. Bloch,

Desiderius wished to impress upon both contemporaries and posterity the accomplishments of the Monte Cassino scriptorium under his rule. Both in the frequency and in the character of the references to his encouragement of the copying of MSS he surpasses all his predecessors. Other abbots, for example, had had themselves depicted in the act of presenting a book to St. Benedict. Abbot John I (914–34) was shown in a miniature executed when the Cassinese congregation was still in exile in Capua, probably in 919 or 920, offering the Saint a MS of Paul the Deacon's Commentary on the Benedictine Rule.<sup>5</sup> A century later, Abbot Theobald had himself depicted, in a copy of Gregory's *Moralia*, presenting that very book to the abbey's patron.<sup>6</sup> Only in Desiderius' presentation scene, however, in Vaticanus latinus 1202, fol. 2, do we find a proud heaping-up of books, and only here a verse pointedly calling the Saint's (and the reader's) attention to their quality and their numbers:

*Cum domibus miros plures. pater accipe libros.*<sup>7</sup>

Even the gift of churches and lands in the miniature below does not call for such praise of its own beauty and magnitude:

*Rura' lacus' presto. Caeli michi prestitor esto.*

This same most splendid volume is not content to depict in paint alone the accomplishments of the Abbot. On the page following the presentation scenes a long poem of acrostic stanzas spells out the words DESIDERIUS ABBAS. The sixty anapaestic verses are quantitative, not rhythmical, and recount the *virtutes* of Desiderius.<sup>8</sup> The poem, like the paintings, is quite explicit in relating how Desiderius had enriched the library of the Cassinese congregation.

"Monte Cassino's Teachers and Library in the High Middle Ages," *La scuola nell'occidente latino dell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, 19 (Spoleto, 1972), 563–613. For his account of literary activity and book copying under Abbot Desiderius, see especially 582–602. A second recent study of great importance for the history of the scriptorium is that of Dom Tommaso Leccisotti in the introduction to his catalogue of the abbey's documents, *Abbazia di Montecassino. I registi dell'archivio*, I, Ministero dell'Interno. Pubblicazioni degli Archivi di Stato, LIV (Rome, 1964), pp. vii–xlv. Because the preservation of both MSS and documents in medieval Monte Cassino was entrusted to the same monk and carried on in the same place, this history of the archive and of its keepers is filled with most useful information for the student of the Cassinese scriptorium and book collection. For the 11th century, see especially pp. xiv–xv.

<sup>5</sup> Monte Cassino 175, p. 2. For facsimile, see H. Bloch, "Monte Cassino, Byzantium and the West in the Earlier Middle Ages," *DOP*, 3, fig. 217 (in Bloch's forthcoming publication, *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages*, to be copublished by Edizione di Storia e Letteratura, Rome, and the Harvard University Press, many of the figures cited here from his article in *DOP*, 3, will reappear); H. Belting, *Studien zur Beneventanischen Malerei* (Wiesbaden, 1968), pl. 177.

<sup>6</sup> Monte Cassino 73, p. iv. For facsimile, see Bloch, "Monte Cassino," fig. 218.

<sup>7</sup> For facsimile, see Bloch, "Monte Cassino," fig. 219; and, in color, *Miniature cassinesi del secolo XI illustranti la vita di S. Benedetto*, ed. M. Inguañez and M. Avery (Monte Cassino, 1934), opp. pl. 1; and A. Pantoni, *Le vicende della basilica di Montecassino*, Miscellanea Cassinese, XXXVI (Monte Cassino, 1973), frontispiece. The reproduction in Pantoni's book shows with particular clarity the hexameter verses beneath the miniatures of the presentation scene in Vat. lat. 1202.

<sup>8</sup> Published by E. Dümmler, in "Lateinische Gedichte des neunten bis elften Jahrhunderts," *NA*, 10 (1885), 356–57, and more recently in *Miniature cassinesi*. The verses are attributed to Alfano of Salerno by G. Falco, "Un vescovo poeta del secolo XI: Alfano di Salerno," *Archivio della Reale Società romana di storia della patria*, 35 (1912), 439–81. See also A. Lentini, "Rassegna delle poesie di Alfano da Salerno," *BISI*, 69 (1957), 213–42, esp. 223–24 and 240; and the new edition of the poems of Alfano, prepared by the same Dom Anselmo Lentini and by Dom Faustino Avagliano, *I carmi di Alfano I*, in *Miscellanea Cassinese*, XXXVIII (Monte Cassino, 1976), no. 54.

*Boreas solet ardua quotquot  
foliis iuga spargere tottot  
titulos tulit hic variorum  
varia ex regione librorum.*<sup>9</sup>

In these lines Alfano, if it is he, reshaped two of Virgil's powerful similes,<sup>10</sup> but in a way which also evoked very vividly the leaves of a newly written codex spread out to dry and perhaps blanketing the scriptorium or cloister.<sup>11</sup> The poet stresses the wide variety of types of books, and the different places from which the texts came.

The second manuscript that bears contemporary testimony to the activities of Desiderius the bibliophile is one still at the abbey. It is Monte Cassino 99. Here the presentation scene is accompanied by a colophon, consisting of verses at the beginning and end, and a long prose statement.<sup>12</sup> From these we learn that the book was executed by the scribe Leo in the year 1072. Here is the part essential for our purpose, the opening verses and the beginning of the prose statement:

*Accipe dignanter quod fert pater alme' iohannes.  
Munus. et æterni sibi confer munera regni.  
Supplicis ac votis pius inde faveto leonis.  
Est studio cuius opus actum codicis huius.;. .;*

*Anno dominice.  
incarnationis millesi  
mo septuagesimo secundo.'  
indictione decima.'  
Cum post transitum sanctissimi  
et eximii patris Benedicti/  
in hoc eius venerabili cénobio  
casinensi ubi sacratissimum  
eiusdem patris et legislatoris nostri/  
qui ipsius egregie sororis  
Scolasticę corpora honorifice  
humata quiescunt/ Septimo  
et tricesimo loco domnus  
Desiderius venerabilis abbas*

<sup>9</sup> The MS seems to show an erasure after the word *solet*. In the second line, *tottot* is added by a different hand, over an erasure. At the end of the stanza there is no punctuation visible today. For verification of, and help with, these details, I am indebted to the Rev. Dr. C. V. Burns of the Archivio segreto vaticano, and also, through him, to Prof. R. Volpini of the Vatican School of Palaeography and Diplomatics.

<sup>10</sup> *Aen.*, VI.309–10, and IV.441–46.

<sup>11</sup> On such a picture from a medieval monastic source, see P. Meyvaert, "The Medieval Monastic Claustrium," *Gesta*, 12 (1973), 53–59.

<sup>12</sup> The presentation scene, verses, and prose statement are on pp. 3–4 of the MS. For facsimile of the miniature and first set of verses, see Bloch, "Monte Cassino," fig. 220, and P. d'Ancona, *La miniature italienne* (Paris–Brussels, 1925), pl. iv. For a full transcription of the two sets of verses and the prose colophon, see F. Newton, "Beneventan Scribes and Subscriptions With a List of Those Known at the Present Time," *The Book Mark*, Friends of the University of North Carolina Library, 43 (1973), 25–26.

*præssset.' inter cetera suorum  
monimenta magnâlium quibus  
præ omnibus suis antecessoribus  
mirifice floruit.' hunc quoque  
pulcherrimum librum describi  
præcepit. Continentem scilicet . . .*

Brought together here are the familiar Cassinese and particularly Desiderian themes of Monte Cassino's founding by St. Benedict, its possession of the relics of SS. Benedict and Scholastica, the many noble accomplishments of the Abbot, and the very great beauty of this book, which he ordered to be written. Desiderius is even said to excel all his predecessors in such *magnalia*.

It is striking to compare the three sets of verses in praise of Abbot Desiderius, dating from his reign, with the verse subscription in praise of Abbot Manso, dated in the year 991 but preserved only in a much later copy of the original.<sup>13</sup> The Manso verses run, as they have come down to us:

*Sollempnis memorandus et omnibus aptus  
Abbas preclaro uocatus nomine manso  
Istum quippe locum ueteri conamine structum  
Studuit ornare mirisque modis celebrare  
Eximii patris benedicti in honore beati  
Hoc opus adiungens iussit quia scribere libens  
Hunc Iosepi librum ueterum monimenta tenentem  
Annis nongentis primo et nonaginta peractis  
Postquam per carnem christus successit in orbem  
Quarta indicione tunc incipiente scilicet  
Iamque sedens pastor gregem sex rexerat annis  
Prestet ei dominus et uitam tempore multo.  
Amen. deo gratias.*

Here we can see the change of style in occasional Latin verse at Monte Cassino in the intervening eighty years. We can also see—what is more significant—the marked contrast between the very halting and ungrammatical verses on Manso and the smoothly polished verses on Desiderius. Here, it seems, is a palpable sign of the effects of that *maxima paupertas* of books that the chronicler says prevailed before Theobald's activities in the copying of manuscripts, and a measure of the difference between the level of literary accomplishment at the abbey at the end of the tenth century and that in the third quarter of the eleventh.

But neither lengthy prose colophons nor penned and painted miniatures nor facile hexameters and anapaests serve as the most explicit evidence today for the achievements of Abbot Desiderius in enlarging and enriching the library

<sup>13</sup> The verses are found in Vat. lat. 1987. They were first printed by V. Ussani, their discoverer, in "Un ignoto codice cassinese del così detto Egesippo e i suoi affini," in *Casinensia* (Monte Cassino, 1929), II, 601–14. They are also printed in MGH, *Poetae*, V, pt. 2 (Berlin, 1939), 412f., note 80. The first line is defective.

of Monte Cassino. For the most precise notice of the books copied at Desiderius' behest we turn to the compiler of the *Chronicle* of Monte Cassino.<sup>14</sup> The famous passage from the *Chronicle* reads (the paragraph divisions and numbers being added by the present writer):

*Non solum autem in aedificiis, verum etiam in libris describendis operam Desiderius dare permaximam studuit. Codices namque nonnullos in hoc loco describi praecepit, quorum nomina haec sunt. 1. Augustinum contra Faustum.*

*2. De opere monachorum. 3. De sermone Domini in monte. 4. Omelias 50. 5. Super epistolam ad Romanos. 6. Sermones. 7. Epistolas Pauli. 8. De Genesi ad litteram. 9. Epistolas eius. 10. Pastorale eius. 11. De baptismo parvulorum. 12. Ambrosium de rebus gestis in ecclesia Mediolanensi. 13. De patriarchis. 14. De fide ad Gratianum imperatorem. 15. Sermones eius. 16. Registrum Leonis papae. 17. Registrum Felicis papae. 18. Regulam Basili. 19. Ieronimum super Ezechielem. 20. Super epistolas Pauli. 21. Super duodecim prophetas. 22. Eugepium. 23. Sermones Severiani.*

*24. Historiam Anastasii. 25. Historiam Langobardorum, Gothorum, et Wandalorum. 26. Historiam Iordanis episcopi de Romanis, et Gothis. 27. Historiam Gregorii Turonensis. 28. Iosephum de bello Iudaico. 29. Historiam Cornelii cum Omero. 30. Historiam Erchemperti. 31. Bedam super Tobiam. 32. De locis sanctis.*

*33. Euangelium maiorem auro et lapidibus pretiosis ornatum, in quo has reliquias posuit: de ligno Domini, et de vestimentis sancti Iohannis euangelistae. 34. Sermones Leonis papae. 35. Sermones Gregorii Nazianzeni. 36. Doctrinam patrum. 37. Sacramentorum cum martirologio. 38. Sacramentorum aliud. 39. Ordo episcopalis. 40. Gualfridum de officiis. 41. Super regulam. 42–45. Passionaria totius anni, libros quattuor. 46–47. Antiphonaria de die duo in choro semper habenda. 48. Antiphonarium de nocte. 49. Vitas patrum. 50. Instituta patrum. 51. Actus apostolorum cum epistolis canonicis, et apocalipsin. 52. Epistolas Pauli. 53. Paralipomenon. 54. Super cantica canticorum Origenis, Gregorii, et Berengarii. 55. Iohannem Crisostomum de reparatione lapsi. 56. Dialogum, quem ipse cum Alberico diacono edidit de miraculis monachorum loci istius. 57. Dialogum aliud. 58. Dialogum de vita sancti Benedicti.*

*59. Hilarius mysteriorum, et ymnorum. 60. Sedulium de euangelis. 61. Iuvenum de euangelis. 62. Medicinalis. 63. Psalterium. 64. Cresconium de bellis Libicis. 65. Versus Arichis, Pauli, et Caroli. 66. Versus Paulini. 67. Ciceronem de natura Deorum. 68. Instituta Iustiniani. 69. Novellam eius. 70. Terentium. 71. Oratium cum Geometria. 72. Ovidium Fastorum. 73. Senecam. 74. Virgilium cum egloga Theodori. 75. Donatum.*

<sup>14</sup> *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, III.63, in MGH, SS, VII (*supra*, note 1), 746–47. I am assured by Professor Hoffmann, who is preparing the new edition of the *Chronicle* for the MGH, that there are no major textual corrections to be made in this passage. The demonstration of Professor Hoffmann that this portion of the text is the work of Guido, Leo of Ostia's successor, sets this list of books upon an even firmer foundation as a reliable reflection of the Desiderian activity in the copying of books.

Like the miniature in Vaticanus latinus 1202 and the accompanying verse, this account associates the copying of books with the erection of buildings: the topics signaled by the words *in aedificiis* and *in libris describendis* provide the rhetorical balance for the first sentence. The two means of enriching the abbey are closely linked in the author's mind.

The arrangement of the list of books that follows is approximately that followed in many medieval book inventories.<sup>15</sup> Many other inventories, however, omit some major type of book; this one does not. Broadly speaking, the Fathers come first, and those in a roughly alphabetical order: St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, then, after two papal registers, the rule of St. Basil and works of St. Jerome. Eugippius is, of course, the volume of extracts from Augustine.

Next comes history. The number of books is most impressive; would that all these manuscripts could be found today! At the end, after Erchempert, Bede seems to be included among the historians, although it is not in fact his History that is mentioned.

The next large section appears to consist of service books, beginning with a Gospel book with a distinguished cover worthy of reverence for the fragment of the Cross and other relics. This group includes sermon books, specific liturgical manuscripts such as missals, ordinals, and choir books, as well as Walafrid Strabo's little treatise on the divine offices and Paul the Deacon's commentary on the rule of St. Benedict. Here also is found John Cassian's *Institutiones*, which was basic to monastic devotions. Then, three manuscripts of different sections of the Bible. The single volume that contained three separate commentaries on the *Song of Songs* and another book containing St. John Chrysostom's *De reparatione lapsi* perhaps were thought of also as principally for service readings. A particular kind of service book closes out this section: three volumes associated with the major feasts of Monte Cassino.

The final section is typical of such lists. It is devoted to what we might call the liberal arts, especially *belles-lettres*, and is introduced, as is fitting, by the ancient Christian poets Hilary, Sedulius, and Juvenius. The Psalter is associated with the poets. The works of later antiquity and the Middle Ages, such as Cresconius Corippus' *Iohannes* and the volume of Carolingian court poetry are intriguing. The classics are grouped, as usual, at the very end. They form a noble series, and include legal and grammatical works alongside purely literary ones.

Such an inventory can be read as a precious document in intellectual history. The very opening of the list (numbers 1–11) reveals the strong impulse of interest in Augustine, and the handsome folio survivors of this collection—one might almost call them a set—are among the first volumes one encounters on the shelves of the abbey's archives today.<sup>16</sup> But the interest in Augustine goes

<sup>15</sup> See, for example, the almost contemporary and very full catalogue of the holdings of Toul, given in G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), 149–54. The Toul catalogue lists Bibles before the Fathers; in other respects it resembles our list.

<sup>16</sup> The arrangement of MSS today is by format, beginning with the largest, and within each size, alphabetically by author.

back to Abbot Theobald.<sup>17</sup> It is the same with another category of texts (number 58), the lectionaries which contain the Lives of SS. Benedict (that is, the second book of Gregory's *Dialogues*), Maur, and Scholastica, a type of book which was distinctively Cassinese. We can trace its history at least as far back as Theobald, whose *Commemoratorium* tells us he had copied at S. Liberatore alla Maiella a *vita Sancti Benedicti, et Sancti Mauri et Sancte Scholastice in uno volumine*.<sup>18</sup>

The list reveals, furthermore, an interest in epistolography. The two papal registers (numbers 16 and 17)—their survival is a different problem—may, as Dr. Dietrich Lohrmann surmised,<sup>19</sup> have interested the monks of Monte Cassino because of the primary concern with canon law and Roman law, and because of the light they might throw upon relations with Constantinople. I would add the conjecture that the letter as a literary form was especially a concern of the Monte Cassino of Albericus, in the period of developing interest in *dictamen*, and that this is in part the reason not only for the inclusion of the two papal registers but also for the letters of Augustine. Again, the Desiderian library is building upon earlier foundations. Theobald, while still at Maiella, began the copying of the letters of St. Jerome,<sup>20</sup> and Lawrence of Amalfi copied *sententiae* from Jerome's letters into his *florilegium* and used these extracts to adorn especially the opening and closing of his literary works.<sup>21</sup> The theorists and practitioners of letter writing in the time of Desiderius provided themselves with a richer variety of models than their predecessors had done.

Yet another genre is perhaps explained in the same way. The form of the literary dialogue had a special place at Monte Cassino from the time of Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*. We have seen the sort of lectionary that grew up at Monte Cassino around the second book of that work. Even in the eleventh century the genre was still viable. Desiderius himself contributed testimony to the continuous presence of St. Benedict and his *virtutes* with the *Dialogue* which bore his name, listed here (number 56). I am persuaded that this interest in the literary form of the dialogue called forth, at least in part, the interest in the classical philosophical dialogues of Seneca and Cicero (numbers 67 and 73).

For many reasons the collection of historians in the list is striking. I have already remarked on the large and conspicuous place assigned them. History had been cultivated at Monte Cassino since at least the time of Paul the Deacon and his *History of the Lombards*. In the century before Desiderius, Abbot Manso

<sup>17</sup> The first three books mentioned in the Theobaldan list (*supra*, note 1) are Augustine texts; they are the second part of the *De civitate dei*, the *De trinitate*, and the *Enarratio in psalmos*.

<sup>18</sup> M. Inguanez, *Catalogi codicum Casinensium antiqui (saec. VIII–XV)*, Miscellanea Cassinese, XXI (Monte Cassino, 1941), 65.

<sup>19</sup> *Das Register Papst Johannes' VIII. (872–882)*, Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, XXX (Tübingen, 1968), 109–17, esp. 112–17.

<sup>20</sup> Inguanez, *Catalogi*, 65.

<sup>21</sup> See, for example, the beginning and end of his *Passion of St. Wenceslaus*, in *Laurentius monachus Casinensis, archiepiscopus Amalfitanus, Opera*, ed. F. Newton, in MGH, *QuellGeistGesch.*, VII (Weimar, 1973), 25, 27, and 41–42. For the contents of Lawrence's *florilegium*, see *idem*, "Tibullus in Two Grammatical *Florilegia* of the Middle Ages," *TAPA*, 93 (1962), 263–65.

caused the Josephus (the so-called Hegesippus), already mentioned, to be produced, and adorned it with his own subscription, itself a mark of distinction and pride.<sup>22</sup>

Abbot Theobald laid the foundation for the collection of historians (mostly Christian in his day) that was to grow into such a magnificent treasure. At San Liberatore he began the copying (as his *Commematorium* tells us) of *Storia Anglorum* and *Ystoria pauli orosii et mendi* (= *mundi*).<sup>23</sup> At Monte Cassino he had copied (according to the entries in two Monte Cassino MSS) in the year 1023 the following historical works:<sup>24</sup> *Chronica Sancti eusebii cesariensis episcopi et hieronimi presbiteri et ysidori episcopi et prosperi et johanni. Historia Romanorum. Historia Langobardorum*.<sup>25</sup>

It was probably Theobald's successor, Richerius, who added the greatest jewel to the collection. A German himself, he appears to have imported from Germany and to have had copied the text of Tacitus' *Histories* and the second half of the *Annals*.<sup>26</sup> The famous MS, in Florence today, is certainly of the mid-eleventh century. Perhaps at the same time the abbey acquired the text of Tacitus' *Agricola* which was used by Peter the Deacon there a century later.<sup>27</sup> Another acquisition from Germany, Widukind of Corvey's *Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum libri III*, still found at Monte Cassino,<sup>28</sup> is to be associated with this period also.

Returning to our inventory of Desiderian books given in the *Chronicle*, we may conclude that the Abbot inherited an interest, long established and encouraged at the abbey, for historical study. To the collection of his predecessors he makes splendid additions of his own. They include Anastasius' *Historia Tripartita* (number 24), Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum* (number 25; another copy then, after Theobald's), Jordanes' *Romana* and *Getica* (number 26), Gregory of Tours' *Historia Francorum* (number 27), another Latin Josephus (number 28; a text which clearly retains its popularity), the so-called Dares Phrygius, *De excidio Troiae*, translated by Cornelius Nepos, together with some other work on Troy (number 29), and finally Erchempert's *History* (number 30).<sup>29</sup> These lines from the *Chronicle* then allow us to reconstruct the climate of historical reading and specifically the strong interest shown in regional,

<sup>22</sup> See *supra*, p. 40 and note 13.

<sup>23</sup> Inguanez, *Catalogi*, 65.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>25</sup> The correspondence between the historians whose works Abbot Theobald had copied and those from whom Lawrence of Amalfi read and copied selections is very marked. The question will be discussed in detail in my monograph treating the works known to Lawrence and the surviving books which he annotated. To the historians proper whose works were copied under Theobald, we may add Augustine's *De civitate dei*, which provided a Christian philosophy of history to late antiquity and the Middle Ages. The Theobaldan copy of the second part of this work, corrected by Lawrence of Amalfi, and containing one of the two lists of Theobaldan books, may be seen at Monte Cassino today (MC 28). See *Laurentius, Opera*, ed. Newton, 15 and 43.

<sup>26</sup> E. A. Lowe, "The Unique Manuscript of Tacitus' *Histories* (Florence, Laur. 68.2)," in *Casinensia* (Monte Cassino, 1929), I, 257-72.

<sup>27</sup> H. Bloch, "A Manuscript of Tacitus' *Agricola* in Monte Cassino about A.D. 1135," *CPh*, 36 (1941), 185-87.

<sup>28</sup> It is now part of MC 298.

<sup>29</sup> On the proper identification of number 29, see Lowe, "The Unique Manuscript," 261-63.

national, and local history which lay behind the Monte Cassino historical achievements of the second half of the eleventh century, Amatus' *Historia Normannorum* and—at a much higher level—Leo of Ostia's *Chronicle*.

The book list that the *Chronicle* gives us is impressive. The seventy-five volumes would constitute a splendid monument if we had some way of setting them on a single range of shelves together. They demonstrate the variety of authors that so struck the poet:<sup>30</sup>

... titulos tulit hic variorum  
varia ex regione librorum.

They reflect strikingly the intellectual interests of the age. And they include a number of treasures, and indeed some texts that were unique. Yet the list has some curious gaps which make us ponder. One is in the realm of the quite ordinary. The most basic and popular texts for monastic reading would surely include such standbys as Gregory's *Moralia* and John Cassian's *Collationes*. These are not found in our survey. Are we to suppose that in the almost thirty years of Desiderius' reign these texts were not copied at all? Again, while the list we have is rich in older literary works of the region of Southern Italy—one notes such names as Paulinus of Nola (number 66), Paul the Deacon (numbers 25 and 41), and Erchempert (number 30)—there is only one contemporary author to be found here, and that is the Abbot himself, whose *Dialogue* on the miracles of St. Benedict is specified (number 56). We may concede, too, that under the not very precise label *Medicinalis* (number 62) may lie the work of Constantinus Africanus. And yet, is it possible to imagine that the abbey which provided so hospitable a reception to the African teacher produced only one medical manuscript in this same period of almost three decades? Beyond the one certain contemporary work of Desiderius himself, there is no reflection in the book list of the other literary accomplishments of the period—Alfanus, Amatus, Guaiferius, Albericus, Constantinus, and others.

We can corroborate these criticisms from another point of view, as well. The student of South Italian scriptoria in the Middle Ages is indebted above all to the late E. A. Lowe, who showed scholars how to date with considerable precision the surviving MSS in Beneventan script. When we find that Lowe has assigned the term "Desiderian" to a Beneventan MS, we naturally turn to the *Chronicle* list to identify it. An example is Monte Cassino 54, Cassian's *Collationes*; another is Monte Cassino 75, Gregory's *Moralia*. Both of these MSS are called by Lowe "probably Desiderian," and that date seems quite correct to me.<sup>31</sup> Yet, as I have remarked, these common, popular texts are not found in the inventory.

Besides, there are one or two MSS that—rare birds indeed!—are dated by other, internal, evidence. Among the most illustrious Cassinese writers of the Desiderian period was Amatus. The copy of his verses in honor of SS. Peter and Paul which was made for presentation to Pope Gregory VII lies in Bologna

<sup>30</sup> See *supra*, pp. 38–39

<sup>31</sup> Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (*supra*, note 4), 75.

today, in the University Library.<sup>32</sup> It once contained a note which gave the year of its writing—1070. Yet, strangely, it is not mentioned in our catalogue of Desiderian products.

There are, then, gaps even in this admirable document. We must suppose that the chronicler or his source saw no reason to include all the most common texts that were copied at the abbey under Desiderius, such as Cassian's *Collationes*. Presumably omitted also were presentation copies which, like the *Amatus*, were not in fact additions to the possessions of St. Benedict. It seems the author also excluded works of the contemporary Cassinese writers because he had mentioned those works elsewhere in his *Chronicle*. The paragraph immediately preceding this list, for example, told of the coming of Guaiferius of Salerno to the abbey and listed his works. Probably the author would have thought it otiose to mention them here as well. Hence Monte Cassino 280, which could well be contemporary, finds no place in the list. It contains works of both Guaiferius and Alfano. The chronicler also omits the most splendid service books, which he describes separately elsewhere. What we have, in fact, is a document considerably shaped by editorial pruning on the part of the historian himself.

The modern student who attempts to reconstruct the Desiderian scriptorium and identify its products has then two very different kinds of aids: the list drawn from the *Chronicle*, and his knowledge of Beneventan paleography. It is clear that because of the nature of the chronicler's method one cannot rely solely upon his list. Yet there are other features which show that we cannot rely solely upon our grasp of Beneventan paleography, either.

Of the seventy-five volumes enumerated here, more than a third can be identified today with some certainty. Among those that have not been identified, perhaps the greatest losses are the MS of Cresconius' poem (number 14) and that containing the verses of Paul the Deacon, Duke Arichis, and Charlemagne (number 65). A number of volumes of the historians cannot be found. And, in view of Alfano's debt to Horace, we would certainly like to see, if we could, the volume of the *Odes* (number 71) which he doubtless used. On the other hand, some very precious texts have been preserved, such as the unique Hilary (which is now at Arezzo, in the Biblioteca Consorziale della Città, MS 405), and the valuable texts of Cicero (number 67), now Leiden, Bibl. Publ. Univ. 118, and Seneca (number 73), now Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C90 inf.

For one who has examined and compared the survivors, their most striking aspect is the variety they present. Their very size may vary widely.<sup>33</sup> Probably the largest are the great Lectionaries associated with the founder himself. Desiderius' *Dialogue* on the miracles of St. Benedict, for example—it is now Vaticanus latinus 1203—measures 375 × 300 mm., its written space 225 ×

<sup>32</sup> It is today Bologna, University Library, MS 2843. On this MS, see A. Lentini, *Il poema di Amato su S. Pietro apostolo*, Miscellanea Cassinese, XXX (1958), pl. II.

<sup>33</sup> I have examined all the books cited in this discussion of the physical layout of Desiderian MSS, a privilege for which I wish to thank most warmly the keepers of the several collections, and particularly Dom Tommaso Leccisotti, Archivist of the Badia di Montecassino.

155 mm. And into that writing space are set only twenty-two lines of text in two columns, a breathtaking display of margin in its mere layout.

Probably the smallest of Desiderian MSS contains, ironically, a text by another Cassinese author, the dedication copy, already mentioned, of Amatus' verses on SS. Peter and Paul, now Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria 2843. It measures only  $170 \times 110$  mm. and its written space  $112 \times 70$  mm., with sixteen lines to the page—the whole being about the size and shape of a standard modern paperback book.

Among the most impressive in size and uniformity are a group that after all the losses of the centuries still stand (in large number) side by side on the shelves at the abbey. They are the folio Augustine MSS—as impressive in their physical presence today as in the *Chronicle's* stately roll call. With Eugippius (number 22, now MC 13) and Anastasius Bibliothecarius (number 24, MC 6), the volumes of Augustine's *50 Homilies* (number 4, MC 11), *Sermons* (number 6, MC 12), *Contra Faustum* (number 1, MC 15), and *Epistles* (number 9, MC 16) present a great similarity of layout, as Dr. Lohrmann saw.<sup>34</sup> The standard measurement is (to take specifically the *Contra Faustum*) overall  $330 \times 250$  mm., with writing space in two columns measuring  $260 \times 190$  mm. and thirty-four lines to the page. Perhaps the same hands appear in more than one of them. Similar pairings occur in a good many other instances; less sumptuous than these folios are the other Augustine MSS, generally written solid on the page with twenty-five to thirty lines per page.<sup>35</sup> This group also includes the Hilary at Arezzo and the Cicero at Leiden.<sup>36</sup>

Two strikingly similar books are the Juvenius (number 61, now MC 326) and the binion (now in the composite MS Vaticanus latinus 14437), which is all that remains of the Paulinus (number 66). The latter—one of the great Beneventan finds of recent years—was published by Professor Rino Avesani.<sup>37</sup> The two poets are presented in a writing space of  $158 \times 95$  mm. with twenty-two lines to the page. Beyond that, the scribe of each followed the rather distinctive practice of putting the punctuation in a vertical line at the right side of the writing space. Paleographically these MSS are *gemelli*, a fact which clinches Avesani's most convincing identification of the Vatican fragment as the Desiderian Paulinus.

Of course, the overwhelming aspect of at least some of these books lies in their ornamentation, and here, too, we find the most striking differences. This paper does not seek to provide a survey of the subject of Desiderian orna-

<sup>34</sup> Lohrmann, *Das Register* (*supra*, note 19), 8. My notes disagree slightly with Dr. Lohrmann's statement regarding the number of lines to a page.

<sup>35</sup> For example, number 2, Augustine's *De opere monachorum*, is still at the abbey in MC 173; it measures  $235 \times 170$  mm. ( $185 \times 115$  mm.), written in a single column with 25 lines to the page. Number 11 is the same father's *De baptismo parvulorum*, today MC 172, with the measurements  $265 \times 185$  mm. ( $200 \times 130$  mm.), also written whole page, with 30 lines to the page.

<sup>36</sup> Now Arezzo, Bibl. Cons. della Città, MS 405, and Leiden, Bibl. Publ. Univ., MS 118. Prof. Hoffmann has now shown that the Arezzo MS was in part copied by one of the scribes who worked on the Munich MS (col. 4623) of Leo's *Chronicle*; see his "Studien" (*supra*, note 2), 162.

<sup>37</sup> In M. C. di Franco, V. Jemolo, and R. Avesani, "Nuove testimonianze di scrittura beneventana in biblioteche romane," *StM*, 3rd Ser., 8 (1967), 877-79.

mentation. Yet, thanks to the work of Professor Herbert Bloch, today we can form a very good idea of the highly significant change in style that took place in the Cassinese atelier in that age. The stylistic change—it might almost be called revolutionary—brought in a profound influence of the School of Ratisbon. So much von Baldass divined.<sup>38</sup> It was E. A. Lowe who saw that the physical model from that school, which inspired the change, was the present Vaticanus Ottobonianus 74—the Gospel book of the German Emperor.<sup>39</sup> The details of this story—the dating of the Ottobonianus to about 1021–22 and the explanation of its imperial miniature (which replaces the miniature of the fourth Gospel writer) as depicting Henry II and the subduing of the Capuan prince Pandulf, the miracle of the Emperor's healing, the presentation of the book to Monte Cassino, where it lay, admired but not copied, for almost fifty years, the rise of a new initial style in the Desiderian period, and more precise dates for the ornamented books that best show the triumph of the new style—all this we owe to Professor Bloch.<sup>40</sup> We can now distinguish in codex Monte Cassino 339, for example, the traditional initial before the influence of the Ratisbon MS began to be felt.<sup>41</sup> It is the sacramentary of our list (number 37). Even in Monte Cassino 99, which is dated precisely to the year 1072, almost all the initials are of this traditional type.<sup>42</sup> In Vaticanus latinus 1202, we can witness the contemporary full utilization of the possibilities shown by the Emperor's gift.<sup>43</sup> We can observe, thanks to the patient tracing of this influence, the adaptation of the new effects in a truly Cassinese creation, which combines at least three lines of influence: the older Beneventan tradition, the newly adopted Ratisbon style, and contemporary Byzantine drawing.

As with the ornamentation, so with the script. The Desiderian scriptorium shows a considerable diversity in the achievements of its Beneventan scribes. A remarkable standard of calligraphy is reached by the scribes of the magnificent service books. This is not the only high point in the history of the Beneventan script. Probably the older view of the development of Beneventan, based on a biological analogy, is not the most useful way to look at it.<sup>44</sup> A rigid scheme of birth, growth, maturity, and decay seems inappropriate as applied to a script. Beneventan, for example, can claim to have reached a notably calligraphic form at Naples in the tenth century, where it possesses a slender elegance that in its spidery fineness is somewhat reminiscent of its distant cousin Visigothic;<sup>45</sup> and again, in the area of Bari in the late eleventh century,

<sup>38</sup> F. von Baldass, "Zur Initialornamentik der Süditalienischen Nationalschrift," *AnzWien*, 48 (1911), no. 25, pp. 290–97.

<sup>39</sup> Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, pl. LXXI and discussion there.

<sup>40</sup> Bloch, "Monte Cassino," 173–87, 201–7; cf. *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages*, I, pt. 1, ii, 1–2, and iv, 2.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 202.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, esp. 203, and notes 125 and 126. For facsimile, see Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, pls. LXVII and LXVIII.

<sup>43</sup> Bloch, "Monte Cassino," esp. 203 note 126, and 204–6. For facsimile, see Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, pls. LXX and LXXI.

<sup>44</sup> For the superior conception of "canonization" in a script, see G. Cavallo, "Struttura e articolazione della minuscola beneventana libraria tra i secoli X–XII," *StM*, 3rd Ser., 11 (1970), 343–68, esp. 343–49.

<sup>45</sup> For examples, see Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, pls. XLVII, XLVIII, and XLIX.

tacet ut maior formido his qui  
deuorandi sunt augeat. Aug.  
de iudea dixit. refer ad hereticos  
qui prima fronte doctrinam et sci-  
entiam promittentes egressi de ecclesia  
deserunt ad idola et omnis eorum igno-  
minia in conspectu amatorum po-  
nit quos prius deciperant et tra-  
diti bestis quas propheta declinat  
dicens. ne tradas bestis animas con-  
fidentium tibi earum morsibus relin-  
quentes.

¶ baali et cherubim et seraphim.

**E**t uisitabo super eos dies baalim  
quibus accendebant incensum  
et ornabant in aure sua et monili suo.  
Et ibat post amatores suos et mei  
obliuisceretur dicit dominus. Lxx. Et ul-  
ciscar super eos dies baalim in quibus  
immolabat eis et circumdabat si-  
bi in aures suas et monilia et ibat  
post amatores suos mei autem ob-  
lita est. dicit dominus. Seruat personam  
meretricis quae auro ornatur et  
gemmis ut placeat amatoribus suis  
et quicquid pulchritudinis non  
habet per naturam arte conquirat.  
Haec in aures quibus aures eius doctri-  
na dei fuerant adornatae et haec mar-  
garita quae ex collo pretiosa pende-  
bat et ita ut sponsus ad eam diceret  
et maritus collum tuum sicut moni-  
lia misit ante portarum pedes et  
dedit sanctis canibus et impletum est  
quod in prouerbiis legimus. Sicut  
mauris aurea in auribus suis ita  
mulieri pessime pulchritudo.  
Hae autem uniuersa faciebant ut seque-

ret amatores et relinqueret uirum.  
Tantumque fuit desiderium uoluptatis  
ac libidinis ut omnem memoriam  
amiserit maritalē et oblita sit  
fuisse se coniugem. Quam obrem in  
ipsis solennitatibus quibus in corde  
habebat ademonibus uisitabit impla-  
gis et corripietur impensis. Baal  
numero singulari baalim plura-  
litē eadem idola nominant genere  
masculino. Vbi cumque enim in fine  
hebraei sermonis. ימים. plurale  
legimus numero plurali genere  
masculino ubi autem ordo. nume-  
ro plurali genere feminino. Ergo  
seraphim et cherubim plurali in-  
tellegamus numero genere mascu-  
lino. Sabaoth autem quod inter-  
pretatur militum aut exercituum si-  
ue uirtutum numero plurali ge-  
nere feminino. Itaque et baalim  
masculino genere nunc sunt plu-  
rali licet quidam male  
תראא תוידא איהו legant gene-  
re feminino. Quomodo autem  
decipiant heretici amatores suos  
et componunt eloquiū uenustate  
structuraque uerborum ut menda-  
cia simulent ueritatem et con-  
iugalem pudicitiam derelinquant  
et incendunt baalim idē idola  
quae de suo corde finxerunt  
quotidie cernimus. Non enim  
habent curā rustice simplici-  
tatis quae meretricia ornamenta  
non querit sed artificis elegan-  
tisque mendacii ut amatoribus

et iniquitatem  
compescere ::

**E**t quidem formam  
inaccessibilem es. mar-  
te transfusus .  
novem annis seg-  
natus . decimo mor-  
tuus :: Quibus au-  
diamus . ut hinc  
testatur . et ratione  
penitus cessat .

et . et ille la-  
et in post minus  
judicis fuit ::  
**C**um non multo  
post formam adu-  
et sic hanc p-  
anno et seg-  
decimo omni-  
et di iudicio seg-  
num cum uita  
per di dia ::

Lexo vii .



St. Sabinus cum cenat . Romae utraque p-  
et la-  
et

FASTORUM LIBER PRIMUS.

**F**estis potius causis laudis est per annum.  
 L'ep'asq; subitissas optatq; signa cœnanti.  
 Ecce pœcato <sup>gesta</sup> gestorum <sup>causa</sup> caula est.  
 Hoc opus. <sup>et</sup> cœnanti digenta <sup>est</sup> laus.  
 Officiis laudem non aduersus honorem.  
 In quibideuato munere deat in ades.  
 Sæptæ recognosces annalibus æquæp'osaf.  
 Equosia mēpato quæq; noatæ d'as.  
 Inuenies ille æfestadomestica nobis.  
 Sæptæ <sup>festis</sup> bi pœatæ est. <sup>festis</sup> pœatæ <sup>festis</sup> auius.  
 Quæq; festis illi festos signa qæ fastus.  
 Tu quoq; cum d'uso p'p'mia f'f'et f'et.  
 Esatæ æp'ma cœnanti æp'ma nos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Quoscumq; <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos ille d'et.  
 Annal' cœnanti p'p'mia <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Deip'mo pœatæ <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.

Pagina iudicium docat subiauramo uatæ.  
 p'p'mia <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Quæstia <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Cuius p'p'mia <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 S'amus <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Ingenij curranz flumina quantatæ.  
 Scilicet <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Auxiliu <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Tempora digere et cum conditor <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Coniuncta menses quinq; bis esse suos.  
 Scilicet <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Curatq; <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Est cœnanti <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Et p'p'mia <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Quod <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Hoc anno <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Per <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Sustinet <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Hæc <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.  
 Cum <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos.

Maquis etax  
 h'æ <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 T'æ <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Quæ <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 A <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 m'æ <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 N <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Non <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 J <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 F <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 N <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Quilam <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 N <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Uer <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Est <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Est <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Uindicat <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 J <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Non <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 N <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Omen <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Dam <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Hec <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 N <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Cœnanti <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 In <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 J <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 Solus <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 D <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 O <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 D <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 E <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 P <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 N <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 L <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 J <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 C <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 E <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos  
 F <sup>festis</sup> festos <sup>festis</sup> festos

ΠΟΥΔΒΑΝΕΙΛΟΥ· ΛΟΓΟΥΔΕΚΗΤΙΚΟΥ· ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΣΕΩΣ ΧΗΡΗΣ  
ΣΟΦΙΑΔΟΣ· ΚΑΙ ΟΙΟΥΣ ΕΝΔΕΔΕΙΤΟΥΣ ΤΑΥΤΗ ΠΡΟΣΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ·  
ΚΑΙ ΟΤΙ ΠΡΟΤΗΤΕΛΕΙΔΕΣ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΔΡΕΤΗ ΕΞΕΩΣ· ΕΠΙΚΙΜ  
ΔΥΝΟΝΤΟ ΕΤΕΡΩΝ ΔΕ ΔΕ ΧΕΘΛΙ ΠΡΟΤΑΔΙΔΝ· ::

ΠΡΟΤΑΔΙΔΝ· ΠΡΟΤΑΔΙΔΝ· ΠΡΟΤΑΔΙΔΝ· ΠΡΟΤΑΔΙΔΝ· ΠΡΟΤΑΔΙΔΝ·

ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ ::  
ΘΟΣ ΕΧΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΠΟΛΛΑ ΩΣ ΟΙΘΥΣΑ  
ΔΑΙΟΝΤΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΙΣ ΤΑΙΣ ΑΛΛΑΙΡΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ  
ΧΛΗΡΩΝ ΕΚ ΜΗΝΕΣ ΜΟΥΣΙΑΣ· ΣΤΟΙΣ ΜΕΛ  
ΧΛΗΡΩΝ ΕΚ ΜΗΝΕΣ ΜΟΥΣΙΑΣ· ΣΤΟΙΣ ΜΕΛ  
ΠΙΣ ΑΜΕΚΛΗ ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΜΕΛΗΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΒΛΕΨΕΣ  
ΥΠΑΣΤΑΙ· ΧΥΘΕΤΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΑΣΤΕΩΣ ΑΜΕΛΙΑ  
ΤΟΥ ΜΕΤΙ ΣΤΕΡΑΜ ΠΟΙΟΥΜΕΝΟ· ΠΛΩΤΕ ΤΟΥ ΔΕ  
ΣΟΥΣ ΟΤΗΝ ΣΤΕΡΑΜ ΠΟΙΟΥΜΕΝΟ· ΠΛΩΤΕ ΤΟΥ ΔΕ  
ΠΩΜΟΡΙΘΩΝ· ΣΤΕΡΑΜ ΠΟΙΟΥΜΕΝΟ· ΠΛΩΤΕ ΤΟΥ ΔΕ



where a lovely roundness and an obsession with the curve dominates the page.<sup>46</sup> Yet the triumph of Beneventan at Monte Cassino under Abbot Desiderius is without doubt the greatest of these flowerings. Its qualities, including especially its regular effect, have been described by Lowe. As he says,<sup>47</sup> "The letters are formed with great firmness and regularity and have some of the beauty that goes with brushwork." And, elsewhere,<sup>48</sup> "The factors which contribute to this regularity are: the perfect alignment and measured spacing of letters and words; the alternation of thin and thick strokes, the thick strokes being oblique, lozenge-shaped, and parallel to each other, characteristics which lend a distinctive appearance to a Beneventan page of the developed period...." Yet it must not be assumed that all Desiderian books showed such painstaking care in their pursuit of regular penmanship.

In their remarkable diversity, our *codices Desideriani* run the gamut from lectionaries and other service books with their large, bold script and their opulent decoration to the chaste simplicity of the Paulinus (Vaticanus latinus 14437). Such a book as the latter was of interest solely for its text and was never expected to show its face outside the library or schoolroom. For an even better understanding of the contrast in its extreme form, a modern student may set two of these products side by side, the large lectionary for the feasts of SS. Benedict, Maur, and Scholastica (Vaticanus latinus 1202) beside the little book with narrow pages (the text is less than four inches wide, but with thirty-eight lines to the page) which contains Ovid's *Fasti* (number 72, now Vaticanus latinus 3262).<sup>49</sup> Not only is there a difference in the format, there is a difference in the degree of regularity of the script as well (see figs. 2 and 3).

In discussing the wide variety which our Desiderian MSS present among themselves, one must not forget the variety of sources from which their texts were drawn. These books were *written* at Monte Cassino (*in hoc loco*), as the chronicler reminds us, but their exemplars came from many different places, as the verses in Vaticanus latinus 1202 specify.<sup>50</sup> This is a subject which, like so many other aspects of the Monte Cassino library, needs much more careful investigation. Here one or two examples will have to suffice. Goldbacher demonstrated that the Desiderian copy of the *Letters* of Augustine which is today Monte Cassino 16 was copied from a MS now in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouvelles Acquisitions 1672.<sup>51</sup> The latter was written at Nonantola in the first half of the ninth century.<sup>52</sup> It was probably in the Beneventan zone by the tenth century, since a hymn was added in good Beneventan at that time.<sup>53</sup> In the period of Desiderius it served as the model for

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, pls. LXV (before 1056), LXXIV, and LXXV (the last two, end of 11th cent.).

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, discussion of pl. LXXI.

<sup>48</sup> *The Beneventan Script*, 125.

<sup>49</sup> The exact dimensions of the entire page are 270 × 128 mm.; of the writing space, 224 × 98 mm. outer, 86 inner.

<sup>50</sup> See *supra*, p. 38-39

<sup>51</sup> *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis episcopi epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, pt. V, CSEL, vol. LVIII (Vienna, 1923), pp. XIX-XXIII.

<sup>52</sup> I am indebted to Prof. B. Bischoff for this information and for the precise date.

<sup>53</sup> The hymn was added on fol. 97v. See E. A. Lowe, "A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts," in *Collectanea Vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda*, II (= ST, 220 [Vatican City, 1962]), 230. I have studied both text and marginalia.

our Augustine; and in the fifteenth century, like some of the other MSS found today in Paris and London, it lay in Benevento.<sup>54</sup> Possibly the Monte Cassino scriptorium borrowed this book from Benevento to make its own copy. After all, Benevento was the birthplace of Abbot Desiderius himself. Besides, we can trace the travels of other MSS which migrated from Monte Cassino to Benevento and the reverse—a story that should be told someday. The peregrinations of the Nonantola-Benevento-Paris MS deserve by themselves a more extensive treatment than this.

One MS should have special consideration because of the exemplar from which it was drawn and the place in which it was copied. Though Desiderian, it found no mention in the *Chronicle* inventory. I refer to the Register of Pope John VIII, which today, as Vatican Regesti 1, stands at the head of that papal *fondo*. To this historic book, Dr. Dietrich Lohrmann has devoted a painstaking and most rewarding study, which is a model, in fact, of codicological research.<sup>55</sup> Here one can only summarize a few of the conclusions of this study. This copy of the register was made under the direction of a master scribe whose hand is seen in the first column of the first page.<sup>56</sup> (An inferior craftsman had made a beginning here, but bungled the task and had to be replaced.) Two scribes divided the work between them thereafter.<sup>57</sup> A hand whose identity is known to us—he is (as Caspar had suggested) none other than John of Gaeta—corrected the whole once it was joined together in order.<sup>58</sup> Lohrmann even suggests—and convincingly—a time and place for the execution of this book.<sup>59</sup> It is the period of the 1070's and the place will have been the Cassinese dependency on the slopes of the Palatine Hill in Rome, S. Maria in Pallara. Here the scribal "team" from Monte Cassino will have had convenient access to the papal archives and to the exemplar of the Johannine register—now lost!—from which they derived their text. Although this splendid register was therefore a possession of Monte Cassino (for at least a century or so) and was copied under Abbot Desiderius, not having been written *at* Monte Cassino (*in hoc loco*), it could not qualify for inclusion in the *Chronicle*'s list of books.

More recently, we have learned from Professor Hoffmann's trailblazing study the identity of the master scribe who copied the first column of this MS.<sup>60</sup> It was none other than Leo Marsicanus, the later chronicler of the abbey's fortunes.

<sup>54</sup> The title added on p. 1 is in the hand of Luigi Feoli, who entered an *ex libris*, titles, and notes in a whole series of MSS that lay in the cathedral library at Benevento in the 15th century. See A. Campana, "Per la storia della biblioteca della cattedrale di Benevento," *Archivio paleografico italiano, Bullettino*, N.S. 2-3 (1956-57), pt. 1, pp. 141-67 and two plates.

<sup>55</sup> *Das Register* (*supra*, note 19).

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 27-32.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 9-27.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 56-94, esp. 80-94.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 102-9. Prof. Hoffmann does not feel it necessary to accept the conclusion that the copying was done in Rome; see his "Studien" (*supra*, note 2), 130 and note 37.

<sup>60</sup> Prof. Hoffmann has also shown ("Studien," 129-30 and pl. iv) the role played by Leo in the copying of Monte Cassino 280, the MS containing *Alfanus'* poems discussed above (p. 46). For a more complete discussion of the Monte Cassino scribes known to us from the 11th century, see my article, "Monte Cassino's Scriptorium and Scribes in the Eleventh Century," to be published in *MedRenSt*, 7 (Summer, 1975).

For the present investigator, the most important aspect of the study of the Desiderian scriptorium is the question of the diversity of hand and script. This part of the investigation is far from complete. Yet already some phenomena thrust themselves upon the observer. An example is the MS of Saint Jerome, *Super duodecim Prophetas*.<sup>61</sup> The only volume from our period that corresponds to this description at all is Monte Cassino 93, a very large folio volume. The problem with this identification is that the MS is in ordinary minuscule, and its decoration matches. It is on the face of it hard to believe that this can be the MS which the *Chronicle* cites as a Monte Cassino product. Not a single word of the text is in Beneventan. Yet the MS has been at the abbey for a very long time. It received the usual Monte Cassino ex libris in the sixteenth century. More importantly, it received a few marginal notes from the end of the eleventh or early twelfth century in a spidery Beneventan. One such note, found on page 20, which reads *Nota baalim et cherubim et seraphim* (see fig. 1), is in the same hand that annotated a number of Monte Cassino MSS, among them, for example, another Jerome volume which I have identified from the Desiderian list, namely, *Ieronimum super Ezechielem* (number 19), which is Monte Cassino 286, in impeccable Beneventan.<sup>62</sup> There can be no doubt, if one examines the history of the Jerome on the Twelve Prophets, a history written on its title page and in its margins, that this is the very volume that was produced in the Desiderian scriptorium.

We have then to reckon with the possibility of some variety: scribes working at Monte Cassino in the age of Abbot Desiderius whose native land (and incidentally their training in calligraphy) was far from the hill of St. Benedict. The scribe of Monte Cassino 93, it is clear, was from Umbria or Tuscany.<sup>63</sup>

It seems that we may have to take into account a variety of languages in our Desiderian MSS, as well. If Sajdak and Mioni were right,<sup>64</sup> the entry in the *Chronicle* list (number 35), *Sermones Gregorii Nazianzeni*, refers to a Greek MS which is found at Monte Cassino today (see fig. 4). It is Monte Cassino 432.<sup>65</sup> This MS contains Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Orationes*, with scholia; also Gregorius Presbyter, *Vita sancti Gregorii theologi*, a *florilegium* of seventy-one *gnomae* drawn from Democritus, Epictetus, Isocrates, and others; Johannes Chrysostomus, *Oratio secunda*; and Nilus Abbas, treatises, orations, and letters. The MS dates from the eleventh century. It also bears the sixteenth-century Monte Cassino ex libris, which Mioni does not mention.<sup>66</sup> Until recently, however,

<sup>61</sup> It is number 21 in my numbering of the inventory.

<sup>62</sup> See, for example, in MC 286, the note on p. 88, left margin: *Nota cherub in singulari.' et cherubim in plurali.'*

<sup>63</sup> A closer examination would reveal that this scribe brought with him habits which go beyond the formation of letters, including layout of the page and decoration, that are foreign to his new home.

<sup>64</sup> *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane*, ed. E. Mioni, I (Rome [1964]), 205-7; J. Sajdak, *De codicibus Graecis in Monte Casino* (Cracow, 1913), 32-57.

<sup>65</sup> There has been considerable confusion in the literature regarding the numbering of the Monte Cassino Greek MSS. They should be cited according to their current shelf marks, as in Mioni's catalogue. MC 432 was formerly MC 278. For their assistance in my study of this MS, I am particularly indebted to my colleagues K. Clark and W. H. Willis.

<sup>66</sup> Instead of being at the foot of the page, as is usual in Monte Cassino MSS, the ex libris has been cunningly written inside the capital H at the beginning. Perhaps the scribe of the ex libris thought it more fitting that a Latin note be added in an inconspicuous way to a Greek book.

I could see no evidence that it was at Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages. The book falls into two parts with completely separate numbering for each part, the second beginning with the John Chrysostom text, but missing at least two entire gatherings here. Nevertheless, the two parts were copied by the same scribe. It seems most probable that this is the manuscript alluded to in a fragmentary enumeration of Monte Cassino books, dating from the end of the fourteenth century, where one of the entries reads: *Opus iohannis crisostomi et gregorii nazazeni I.*<sup>67</sup> So far as I can see, this entry fits no other known Monte Cassino MS. If this is our book, the present Monte Cassino 432, the two parts of the book were reversed at that time, with the John Chrysostom text preceding. We can better understand the loss of some of the text at the beginning of the Chrysostom part if in fact this at one time stood first in the book.

It has been suggested by Dr. Lohrmann that Monte Cassino 432 was imported from the East, conceivably from Byzantium.<sup>68</sup> Yet examination so far seems to place it instead squarely in the framework of the South Italian Greek MSS. This seems, for example, to be the opinion of Père Devreesse, who calls it "gréco-lombard."<sup>69</sup>

The date of this MS of Gregory Nazianzenus may be too early to permit identification with the MS mentioned in the list of Desiderian products. That is the opinion of at least some of the scholars whom I have had the opportunity to consult on this subject.<sup>70</sup> If that is the case, the surviving MS, Monte Cassino 432, may have been the exemplar from which the Desiderian volume was copied. It seems clear, at any rate, that Monte Cassino 432 has been at the abbey since the Middle Ages. The presence of this, and other Greek MSS, in the library of medieval Monte Cassino should alert us to the possibility that one or more of the texts mentioned in the Desiderian list may have been in the Greek language.

The Desiderian period did not see the first scribes at Monte Cassino from regions outside the Beneventan zone. Near the beginning of the eleventh century, for example, a scribe using ordinary minuscule collaborated with Beneventan scribes on a codex of Ambrose on Luke. It is today Monte Cassino 5.<sup>71</sup> In fact, a colophon tells us that it was written under Abbot Atenolf and that one of the Beneventan scribes was John, a subdeacon.<sup>72</sup> We note that the scribe who wrote Caroline minuscule copied only a relatively small section of the MS at the beginning and furthermore did not sign his name, as did one of the Beneventans. Another Monte Cassino MS from later in the century shows a different aspect of the question. I refer to a little volume, Monte Cassino 580, which Dr. Willard studied carefully some years ago.<sup>73</sup> The metrical

<sup>67</sup> Inguanez, *Catalogi* (*supra*, note 18), 13.

<sup>68</sup> Lohrmann, *Das Register*, 116 note 94.

<sup>69</sup> R. Devreesse, *Les manuscrits grecs de l'Italie méridionale*, ST, 183 (Vatican City, 1955), 31-32.

<sup>70</sup> Such was the opinion of Prof. N. Wilson of Oxford University and of Prof. I. Ševčenko of Dum-barton Oaks and Harvard University, whom I thank for their kind assistance.

<sup>71</sup> For facsimile showing the non-Beneventan and Beneventan portions side by side, see Lowe, *Scriptura Beneventana*, pl. LVIII.

<sup>72</sup> For the full text of the subscription, see Newton, "Beneventan Scribes" (*supra*, note 12), 21.

<sup>73</sup> H. Willard, "Codex Casinensis 580 T. *Lexicon prosodiacum saec. XI*," in *Casinensia*, I, 297-304 and plate. Professor Glauche has shown that this treatise was widely copied; see Bloch, "Monte Cassino's Teachers" (*supra*, note 4), 586 note 71a.

handbook—that is indeed what it is—was bravely begun in Beneventan script, but that writing was not natural to the scribe, and after some ten pages of the struggle he lapsed into his familiar Caroline minuscule.<sup>74</sup> This subject deserves a more expanded treatment, but it may be found that no century of Cassinese history was entirely free from the presence and activity of Latin scribes trained in more northern scriptoria.

The presence of Greek monks at Monte Cassino is another subject which remains to be studied. I shall cite a single further example—not a scribe. In the calendar drawn up by Leo of Ostia and preserved in Vaticanus Borgianus latinus 211,<sup>75</sup> many of the entries are accompanied by abbreviated notes to identify the person by home or ecclesiastical office, as *car* for *cardinalis* or *ben* for *Beneventanus*. One who attracted my interest was *Georgius*, whom Professor Hartmut Hoffmann rightly identified as the *custos* of Monte Cassino mentioned in more than one source.<sup>76</sup> He held that office at least in the early years of Desiderius' reign. He attracts notice because of his, seemingly, Greek name. Beside the name in the Borgia MS is the abbreviation *sce*. This might seem to refer to Georgius' home. Thanks to a valuable suggestion from Professor André Guillou, however, I now see that *sce* must refer to Georgius' position. He was *skeuophylax* (= *custos*) of the abbey. What is of immediate interest for us is that this *Georgius*, with his Greek name, and now, in an unimpeachable source, his Greek title, certainly represents a Greek-speaking influence within the abbey at its most glorious epoch. In fact, this man who spoke Greek was the custodian of the abbey's treasure, including the most precious of the books which form the subject of this paper.<sup>77</sup>

It has been shown that paleography is capable of modifying, and revealing the limitations of, the historical evidence which we have in the *Chronicle's* list of Desiderian MSS. Careful examination of the *Chronicle* list causes us to modify and expand the expectations we would have had of the Desiderian scriptorium which were based purely upon paleography. It no longer seems legitimate to visualize the Desiderian library solely in terms of the plates in Lowe's *Scriptura Beneventana*, useful, and indeed fundamental, as those are. A future reconstruction must take into account the remarkable range, in size, in quality of parchment, in layout, in decoration, and finally even in script and perhaps in language, that was possible in the books copied in the Monte Cassino scriptorium in the age of Abbot Desiderius.

Duke University

<sup>74</sup> See especially Willard, "*Codex*," plate showing fols. 21<sup>r</sup> and 36<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> H. Hoffmann, "Der Kalender des Leo Marsicanus," *DA*, 21 (1965), 82–149.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 111 under June 4, and p. 135 with note 45a.

<sup>77</sup> I refer to such liturgical treasures as the present Vat. lat. 1202 and MC 99.

#### ADDENDUM

The recent discussion of South Italian texts in G. Cavallo, "La trasmissione dei testi nell'area beneventano-cassinese," *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo. La cultura antica nell'occidente latino dall'VII al XI secolo* (Spoleto, 1975), 357–424, especially, for eleventh-

century Monte Cassino, 383–96, is most enlightening and valuable for the student of Desiderian MSS. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with Professor Cavallo's dating (*ibid.*, 385–86 and 393) of Vaticanus latinus 3262, the manuscript of Ovid's *Fasti* mentioned *supra* (p. 49 and fig. 3), in the time of Abbot Theobald. I think E. A. Lowe was correct, in *The Beneventan Script* (*supra*, note 4), 362, in assigning the MS to *saec. XI ex*. Yet Professor Cavallo is quite right in considering the hand, with its absence of *cordellato* and other features, atypical of Desiderian writing. The script, however, fits no better into the framework of Theobaldan writing, where Professor Cavallo would place it. The manuscript does possess sure indications of having been at Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages, and I think it is most likely that it is the very codex of Ovid's *Fasti* copied under Abbot Desiderius. The scribe cannot, however, have received his training at Monte Cassino but rather at some provincial center, probably closer to the Bari zone. I intend to give a more detailed discussion of this MS in a forthcoming study.